

THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

VOL. V.

OCTOBER, 1925.

No. 10.

The Meaning of Matt. 8, 21, 22.

PROF. W. ARNDT, St. Louis, Mo.

The incident of the disciple who wished to bury his father before he became a regular follower of Jesus is related in Matthew and Luke. While there is not complete verbal agreement between the two accounts, harmonization presents no difficulty. Every reader will admit that the substance of the two narratives is the same and that, where differences are found, the evangelists simply supplement each other, the one adding a detail or two which the other has not recorded. It is not on account of harmonistic difficulties that the passage is somewhat baffling to some Bible readers, but rather because the principle of filial love and respect apparently is disregarded in the words of Jesus, and because His saying, "Let the dead bury their dead," sounds enigmatical at first. An examination of the passage with a view to setting forth the meaning of the saying of the Savior will, it is hoped, not be unwelcome to the readers of THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

Having told a certain scribe who offered to follow Him of His extreme poverty, the Lord addresses one of His disciples (*μαθητῶν*). We need not assume that this man was one of the Twelve,—an old, but unfounded tradition says it was Philip,—since Jesus, before the opposition against Him crystallized, had many disciples or adherents. (Cf. especially John 6, 60.) According to the report of Luke, Jesus said to the man, "Follow Me." Matthew omits this call. But his account demands that we supply it, since without such a request the statement of the disciple, "Lord, suffer me first to go and bury my father," would be unmotivated and unintelligible. The disciple does not refuse to follow Jesus, but is disinclined to do so immediately. Another duty seems to stand in the way: the obligation to bury his father; and he begged Jesus to permit him first to fulfil this obligation. The view which is usually taken of the situation which this man was in is that his father had just died and that the burial was impending, which the son naturally wished to attend. But let

it be noted that the story does not mention the death of the father at all. That the father had died is an inference drawn from the wish expressed by the man to be permitted to bury his father before enrolling as a regular follower of Jesus. Is that inference unavoidable? In my opinion that cannot be held. The words in question may have been spoken while the father was living and may merely have conveyed the wish for permission to stay with the father till his death and burial. That is the view which the old commentator Theophylact took of the case, and he has many followers. Various considerations may be advanced which lend support to this opinion. Would the man have been in the presence of Jesus at all if his father had died an hour or two before? That seems very unlikely. He would have been at home tending to the details of the funeral, which in Palestine, on account of the warm climate, takes place the same day a person dies, if possible. Furthermore, one cannot well see the point in the order of Jesus if He demanded that the man follow Him without delay while the funeral of the father was but an hour or two off. Why should the Lord have insisted on such an infringement of feelings and custom? Even if He was leaving the neighborhood, the next day would find Him not far away, and this particular man could have joined Him without difficulty. The objection will probably be made here that the words spoken by Jesus to a third man on this occasion and recorded by St. Luke, chap. 9, 61, 62, make it plain that what Jesus insisted on was immediate compliance with His call, and that only if we assume that the father had died and that the son was asking for a few hours' respite shall we be doing justice to the context. The narrative of St. Luke, in the verses alluded to, reads thus: "And another also said, Lord, I will follow Thee; but let me first go bid them farewell which are at home at my house. And Jesus said unto him, No man, having put his hand to the plow and looking back, is fit for the kingdom of God." The leave-taking from the family, it will be argued, could not have consumed much time. How simple for the man to bid good-by to his relatives and then to join Jesus! Still the Lord frowns on the request. It will be held that in the case of this man, Jesus desired to have his companionship without a minute's delay, not a few hours or a day later, and that the presumption is that the Lord's order addressed to the second man had precisely the same meaning. Immediate entrance upon His service is demanded in both cases—so runs the argument. My reply is that this view seems to be based on a misunderstanding of the

words of Jesus. In Luke 9, 62 the Lord does not say: "The matter is so urgent that even leave-taking must be dispensed with." He chides this man for the attitude he takes toward dedicating himself to the direct service of God. The man had not given himself fully to the Lord and was casting wistful looks at his old associations. Not the saying of good-by is branded as wrong by Jesus, but the unwillingness of this man to sever all connections with his relatives for the Lord's and His Word's sake. The question was not whether the circle of regular attendants of Jesus should be entered a few hours earlier or later, but whether the Master should be followed whole-heartedly or with reluctance.

Hence, in my opinion the case of the third man cannot be adduced to prove that Jesus in this context wishes to emphasize that not a minute's delay can be tolerated when He calls for service. That is a true principle, but I do not think that Jesus meant to give expression to it on this occasion.

Furthermore, we must remember, in order to be able to understand why this man asked for permission to stay with his father until the latter's death and burial, that the Jews considered it a sacred duty for a son to give his father a decent funeral. A. T. Robertson, who shares the view of Theophylact, points to Tobit 4, 3 as a passage which reveals Jewish sentiment on this point at that time. It would have been quite natural for a Jewish man whose father was old and decrepit and in all probability not far removed from the grave to refuse leaving his home till after the father had departed this life. Besides, there is a linguistic argument, which, it seems to me, has some weight. The Savior, in reply to the request of the man, says, *ἀκολούθει μοι*, "Follow Me." The form used is the imperative present. We could translate it more aptly thus: "Be My follower" (continued action). The saying of Jesus appears in a totally different light if, bringing out the meaning of the present tense, we render it thus: "Be thou My follower, My disciple, and let the dead bury the dead." The question for the man, then, is not, Shall I follow Jesus to-day or to-morrow, but the question is, Shall I be a direct disciple of Jesus, or shall I do something else for some time to come? If the meaning of the Lord had been, "Leave this minute; start your apprenticeship with Me on the spot," obviously the imperative aorist, denoting punctilious action, would have been the proper form to use.

This view is borne out, too, I think, by the version of Jesus' reply in St. Luke's account, "Let the dead bury their dead, but

go thou and preach the kingdom of God." The words of Jesus may be paraphrased thus: "You think your duty lies at home. In this you are mistaken. You have something far more important to do than to stay with your father and to bury him. You have to preach the good tidings of the kingdom of God." In other words, Jesus is contrasting two occupations and not two points of time for entering upon His service. Considering everything, I hold that the arguments for the interpretation of Theophylact are simply overwhelming. And if we accept it, not even the semblance of undue harshness remains in the words of Jesus.

The man, so we may conclude from all that has been said, was in a dilemma. On the one hand, filial duty demanded that he stay with his father. On the other hand, Jesus calls him to become one of His immediate followers. It was an instance where duties clashed instead of running parallel to each other. Jesus, who on other occasions inculcated obedience toward the Commandment, "Honor thy father and thy mother," as well as toward all other commandments, resolved the doubts of the disciple, telling him that His call had to be given precedence. The Lord here simply insists in practise on what He taught at another time: "He that loveth father or mother more than Me is not worthy of Me."

The remaining part of the paper will have to deal with the much-discussed words of Jesus, "Let the dead bury their dead." The Revised Version, heeding the pronoun denoting possession, renders them thus: "Leave the dead to bury their own dead," a point in which it has the concurrence of Moffatt and Goodspeed. That the pronoun has a certain significance will be seen as we proceed. No ink need be wasted to prove that the first "dead" cannot have reference to such as are physically dead, although Fritzsche advocated this meaning, regarding the word of Jesus as a paradoxical saying, signifying, "Let the dead bury each other! Leave the dead to themselves!" One feels that this view is ascribing a jest to Jesus, which would be without parallel in His other recorded sayings. Some commentators think that *νεκροί* here denotes the corpse-bearers, who had to carry the bodies of the poor out to the cemetery by night because nobody else attended to their burial. If that meaning could be proved for *νεκροί* and could be adopted here, the saying would no longer present any difficulties. But neither would it possess a deep and striking significance. However, I cannot find any evidence at all for this view. Among the Romans there were men appointed

to bury the bodies of the poor, but they were not called *mortui*; their designation was *vespillones*. (Cf. *Exp. Gr. N. T.*) To my knowledge there is no proof showing either that Palestine had public servitors of this kind or that the term "the dead" was so employed. In addition to this, the pronoun "their" excludes this interpretation. If there were *vespillones* in Palestine at that time, they were appointed to bury the dead of the poor, and not particularly their own dead.

Almost universally accepted is this interpretation, "Let those who are spiritually dead bury those who are bodily dead." This seems to me the only tenable and satisfactory explanation. The Bible more than once speaks of those who are unconverted as people that are dead. The passage in Ephesians, chap. 2, 1, is well known: "And you hath He quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins," etc. (*ὅτιας νεκρούς*), where "being dead" evidently describes the state of unbelief here on earth. We can then appeal to Biblical usage if we give the first "dead" a spiritual significance. The pronoun "their" is quite fitting if we accept this view. The Lord says: "Let those who are spiritually dead attend to the funeral of the dead belonging to their family; that is an obligation which they have, they are not unwilling to fulfil it; give them leave (*ἀρεσ*) to do so." In his extended discussion of our passage, Bengel renders "their dead" by *necessarios*, that is, relatives, and points to Gen. 23, 4 as confirming this view.

An interpretation which is now and then put on these words of Jesus makes them say: "Let those who are spiritually dead bury the deceased who during their life were spiritually dead; in other words, let the spiritually dead bury each other; let the funeral of unbelievers be performed by unbelievers." The pronoun "their" then has the significance "of their own kind." But this interpretation of the saying of Jesus cannot be accepted. While the principle that a Christian pastor must not give a Christian funeral to unbelievers has Scriptural warrant, it must not be based on this saying of Jesus. The Lord is here not speaking of the funeral honors which the Christian Church accords its members. He is referring to the burial which people owe to a deceased relative. Besides, He is not laying down a general principle, but merely giving directions to the young man with whom He is conversing as to the course he is to pursue. Surely no one will hold that Jesus means to say: "A believing son must not bury an unbelieving father"; but that very thing would be the sense

of the words of Jesus if we adopted the interpretation under discussion. No, the son was told that he should forego burying his father, not because that would be wrong in itself, but because He had something far more important to do, namely, to preach the kingdom of God. Cf. Luke 9, 60. That the Christian Church must not give a Christian burial to unbelievers rests on other texts, namely, such as 2 Cor. 6, 14—18 and Jas. 4, 4, as well as on all those passages which teach us to be honest, sincere, and truthful; for to grant a Christian burial to an unchristian is, of course, a violation of the principle of honesty. The great abiding truth in the saying of Jesus is that when He calls us to perform a particular task, all else must be subordinated; that in such a case all other duties must be looked upon as being of minor importance, and the sentiment filling us must be that of Isaiah: "Here am I; send me." Is. 6, 8.

The Authority of the Holy Scriptures.¹⁾

The liberal Protestant churches are slowly losing their faith in the Scriptures, and as they lose their faith in the Scriptures, they are slowly losing their religion. The Protestant churches came into existence as a sublime witness to the Bible as the only rule of faith and practise. That was many centuries ago. But now it has come to pass in the strange revolutions of the wheel of history that some of the Protestant churches and many Protestant scholars and theologians are the most determined and dangerous enemies of the Bible. It is four centuries since our noble pioneers of the Reformed Churches gave to the world the Bible as the only rule of faith. To-day no one will deny that at a meeting of representatives of the churches throughout the world holding to the Presbyterian system the question of the authority of the Bible is timely and critical.

The whole issue of Christianity and the spiritual destiny of mankind depend upon the answer to this question, Has God spoken to man? This fundamental question of religion is admirably stated by Bishop Gore in his book *Belief in God*: "This, then, is the question—Has the Divine Mind, or Spirit, taken action on His side to disclose or reveal Himself to those who are seeking after God?"

1) An address delivered at the Quadrennial World Convention of the Alliance of Reformed Churches holding the Presbyterian System, Cardiff, Wales, June 29, 1925.

From the very beginning the unfaltering answer of the Christian Church has been that God has spoken to man, and that we have an infallible record of that revelation in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. This has been the ground upon which the Church, Catholic as well as Protestant, has stood from the very beginning. The only alternative for an infallible record of a divine revelation for our salvation is human reason, and human reason is, as the eloquent American agnostic, Robert Ingersoll, declared it to be, "a flickering torch, borne on a starless night, and blown by the winds of prejudice and passion."

Enemies of the Bible to-day within the Protestant Church are trying to create the impression that the idea of an infallible Bible goes back only to the Reformation, and was foisted upon Christianity by extreme Protestants, who set up an infallible Bible in the place of an infallible Pope.

Nothing could be more preposterous. The Roman Catholic view of the Scriptures is summed up by the declaration of the Vatican Council of 1870, which, having named the books of the Bible, declares them to be sacred and canonical, not because approved by the Church, nor because they contain a revelation with no admixture of error, but "because, having been written by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, they have God for their Author." In his Bampton Lectures of 1893 Dr. Sanday says of the traditional Protestant view of the Bible, as expressed in the great confessions of Protestantism: "This was the view commonly held fifty years ago. And when it comes to be examined, it is found to be substantially not very different from that which was held two centuries after the birth of Christ."

This idea of a true Bible, of course, only with the greatest difficulty can be made to agree with the view that, although the Bible contains high moral and spiritual truth, even revelation, it is also a mass of scientific blunders, historical inaccuracies, and low moral views. The difficulty as between the Bible and science is probably not so acutely felt to-day as it once was. Men are beginning to realize that we know very little about the beginnings of life and of human history, and that, while we talk learnedly about the Rhodesian man and the Pithecanthropus, we are merely decorating the impenetrable veil of silence and mystery with the trinkets of human fancy.

At the same time, although the so-called war between religion and science has abated, we must face the fact that a Bible which is childish, grotesque, and absurd as to its astronomy, geology,

and biology can never exert the moral authority over the minds of men that the Bible did exert over those heroic souls who established the Reformed Churches and built up the civilization of the Protestant nations. You can never open the door to the reception of the Bible as a spiritual authority and guide by first of all describing it as a collection of myths and folk-lore, silly notions of the earth and of man, with here and there very low ideas of God. Yet this is the impossible task that many of our so-called "liberal" Protestants are attempting. But it can never be done until the east meets the west.

The solution of the scientific difficulty lies elsewhere. What we are so sure is experimental and established fact to-day, may assume a different aspect to-morrow, and the last word will be God's. The remarkable thing is that in a book written so many ages ago there should be any ground for a dispute as to whether or not this Book is in agreement with the latest findings of physical science. The grand steps in creation outlined in the Bible are so in keeping with those outlined by science that, as a President of the British Association, Sir William Dawson, once put it, "it would not be easy, even now, to construct a statement of the development of the world in popular terms so concise and so accurate."

The most dangerous attack on the Bible is made by those within the churches who claim that only by such reinterpretations can we mediate between the Bible and the "modern mind," that terrible monster which now threatens to destroy Christianity after it has survived the shocks and the storms of the ages. Perhaps the best key to the whole liberal and modernistic method with the Bible is what is called "Progressive Revelation."

That has a good sound. We all believe in progress, and we all believe in revelation. Therefore, why not Progressive Revelation? But as used by the Modernists, Progressive Revelation is not the true Biblical teaching that God has revealed His will successively and increasingly through patriarchs, prophets, and the Gospel, culminating in Jesus Christ. On the contrary, it is an idea of revelation and inspiration which has been invented to give the Bible some shadow of divine authority after it has been convicted of scientific blunders, historical inaccuracies, and low moral views.

How does this theory of the Bible work? It claims to save the Bible for intelligent faith. But how? In brief it is this:—

We find in the Bible, particularly in the Old Testament,

conceptions of God that are crude and low, narratives of impossible transactions, and statements about the world and its physical history which even a child in the grammar school knows to be absurd. But we are not to let this shake our faith in the Bible as the revealed will of God. The solution of our difficulty is "progressive" revelation. It is the philosopher's stone which transmutes the base metal in the Bible to purest gold.

Apply this stone to Genesis, and the whole difficulty is gone, for now we see how God could, for good and sufficient reasons, reveal Himself as the Creator of the world, and at the same time permit man to imagine and to record a way of creation which is childish and absurd. But we must not let that trouble us. What God had in mind was to tell us about Himself, not about the heavens and the earth.

The Bible says that God commanded Abraham to offer up Isaac on Mount Moriah. But God was only adapting Himself to the prevailing low ideas of God and of what pleased Him, and only by the medium of a contemplated sacrifice could God reveal Himself to Abraham. The stupendous miracles of Moses, Elijah, and Elisha did not really take place. But God did speak to and through these prophets and after generations added the miracles. The Old Testament attributes to God the sanction and approval of acts which are repugnant to the conscience of this generation, such as the judgments upon the Canaanites. But these commands and sanctions were put in God's mouth by men whose moral ideas were those of their own age only, and to whom God Himself, apparently, could not give any higher ideas.

Such is the modernistic idea of the Bible. As one of their most popular preachers has phrased it: "To take a trip through the Bible is to move from the presence of primitive religion to the noblest expression of the religious spirit that the mind of man can take." But we fear that this tour through the Bible, personally conducted by the Modernists, proves too expensive. What the average man wants to know is this: "Where does your primitive religion come to an end in the Bible, and where does your true and divine revelation commence?" Does primitive religion end with Genesis or with Judges, and true religion commence with the Psalms or with the Prophets? Evidently not, for all that is taken exception to is scattered through the Bible, and not the most expert of reinterpreters and restorers can reconstruct the history of revelation showing where the human stratum of misinformation is succeeded by the strata of divine truth.

In short, this popular theory of progressive revelation gets rid of the difficulties in the Bible by getting rid of the Bible. These learned men are simply saying in high-sounding terms what the child said in its naive comment, "I suppose God wrote the Old Testament before He became a Christian!" Why use the word "revelation" at all, progressive or otherwise? For what such an interpretation of the Bible means is that the Bible is largely made up of the guesses or opinions of fallible men about God and is not the Word of God.

There is a true and Scriptural idea of revelation, but it is remote from what I have just sketched. The true revelation in the Bible marks a progress from the partial to the complete, from the transient to the abiding, from what was suited for a people hardly touched by the gracious rays of revelation to what could be received by a people who had been trained for centuries to hear the voice of God, from the Law to grace, from patriarchs and prophets to Jesus Christ Himself.

This is the progressive revelation to which John referred when he said the Law came by Moses, but grace and truth by Jesus Christ. And this was the progressive revelation the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews had in mind when he said in the sublime prologue: "God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in times past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by His Son." But the progressive revelation of the Modernist would compel a revision of the passage in Hebrews, making it read something like this: "God, who at sundry times and in divers manners deceived mankind in times past, giving them false and cruel and ridiculous notions of Himself, of man, of the history of the earth, finally decided to tell the truth in Jesus Christ."

But has He told the truth in Jesus Christ and in the New Testament? Progressive Revelation at once raises that question. Does Progressive Revelation stop with the New Testament? Or will it go on indefinitely? And will the unknown revelation of centuries hence make obsolete the revelation of the New Testament as, according to this theory, the revelation of the New Testament has negatived the revelation of the Old Testament?

Let no one imagine that the Old Testament difficulties are the only ones which are to be treated with this theory. The idea of Abraham's offering up Isaac is disposed of; but so also is the idea of God's offering up His own Son for the sins of the world. The great New Testament idea of the atonement, as explained

and proclaimed by St. Paul and the other apostles, is just as repugnant to the Modernist as the sacrifice of Abraham. One distinguished theologian goes so far as to brand the Pauline idea of the satisfaction of Christ for our sins as comparable to a "frame-up" in the criminal courts, where, for evil purposes, or to satisfy the demand for the punishment of a crime, the perpetrator of which has not been apprehended, the police "frame" an innocent man!

And so this theory would deal with other New Testament facts and doctrines. The story of the Incarnation is not a revelation, but just man's way of trying to account for the preeminent personality of Jesus; the story of the Resurrection does not represent an actual historic fact, but merely represents the only way in which the minds of that day could account for the continuing personality of Christ; and so His Second Advent is only the phrasing of man's hope for the triumph of righteousness. Thus the glory of revelation fades from the pages of the New Testament as well. That great and tremendous music, "Thus saith the Lord!" shaking the earth with its echo, casting down kingdoms and empires, ushering in the glory of redemption in Christ, dies out of the Bible, and in its place we hear only this, "Thus saith the mind of man."

We go back to the question with which we started, with which all discussion of religion must start, Has God spoken to man? And if He has, do we have a true record of what He has said? All the hopes of mankind depend upon the answer. The Scriptures say that God has spoken, spoken through men who were moved by the Holy Ghost, and for centuries the Christian Church has dared to speak to humanity only upon this ground, that it possessed and declared the Word of the living God.

But now, if we adopt the idea of the Bible that is rapidly and fatally gaining ground in the Protestant Church, then the Church can no longer arrest the attention of a fallen race with that ageless cry, "Thus saith the Lord!" At first hearing, it seems very easy to take a trip through the Bible and mark when we leave the territory of primitive religion and pass into the true religion. But what is to be our guide? If some parts of the Bible are false and others true, if this is only tribal religion and stone-age morality, and this the highest and the purest, what is to be our guide in judging, and in distinguishing the one from the other? Ah, there is the fatal question, and the fatal answer must be, "Man's reason!" And this, in turn, means that ultimately

we depend not upon revelation, but upon human reason. The final authority is not the Word of God, but human reason. Thus the world is plunged back into the abyss of human ignorance and despair, where we can hear only the taunting, mocking echoes of our own cries in the darkness.

As to the practical effect the "new view" of the Holy Scriptures is having upon the Christian Church, there could be no more striking evidence than the sad subsidence of redemptive teaching and preaching in the Protestant Church. The great question of the Reformation was this, What shall I do to be saved? and the great answer went with it, Through faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. Wherever a Protestant church lifts its spire towards the heavens, it stands as a monument to the doctrine of salvation by faith. Historically this is so. But, alas! if we enter the churches and hear the message and read the sermonic output of the pulpits, we must conclude that in many churches there are now more important questions to be answered than the old question which rang out on the midnight air at Philippi so many years ago, "What must I do to be saved?"

A deleted Bible means a diluted Gospel. The Bible as the Word of God and the proclamation of the Cross as the power of God unto salvation stand or fall together. Men and brethren, what shall we do? What *can* we do but *pray* that the Holy Spirit, who gave the Scriptures to our fallen humanity, and who has used them through the Church unto the salvation of souls and the glory of God in Jesus Christ, may again be pleased to revive in the Church a great faith in the Bible as the Word of God. Come from the four winds, O breath, and breathe upon these slain that they may live! Awake, O north wind, and come, thou south, and blow upon our garden that the spices thereof may flow forth!

I conclude with these noble words from the hymnal of the Lutheran Church:—

God's Word is our great heritage
And shall be ours forever.
To spread its light from age to age
Shall be its chief endeavor.

Through life it guides our way,
In death it is our stay.
Lord grant, while worlds endure,
We keep its teachings pure
Throughout all generations.

Philadelphia, Pa.

CLARENCE EDWARD MACARTNEY.²⁾

2) This article appeared in the July issue of the *Princeton Theological Review*, whence it has been transferred verbatim to the THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY as evidence that others think about the authority of the Holy Scriptures as Lutherans do.

THE THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER.

An exhaustive Outline of Courses offered in the Extension Division, or Correspondence Course, of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Mo., has been prepared by Dr. Paul E. Kretzmann, who is in charge of this department. He reports an enrolment of over 50 in this course and a lively interest in their studies on the part of all the students enrolled. Send for a copy of these *Outlines* to 3705 Texas Ave., St. Louis, Mo.

DAU.

Latin and Greek in American Institutions. — During the course of the past school-year Mr. James F. Abel, of the Bureau of Education, remarked in *School Life* that 940,000 young people were studying Latin in our secondary schools, and 40,000 more were pursuing courses in it at college — a total of almost 1,000,000 who were studying Latin. He found in fact that Latin enrolled more high school students than "all the other foreign language courses combined." We may rather hesitate, indeed, to class Latin among foreign languages. It is a classic language and, in a sense, a world-language. Mr. Abel further stated that 22,500 teachers of Latin were being employed in our secondary schools and that demand for well-trained Latin teachers was steadily increasing. In all this it can be seen how modern education, after its long experimenting, is returning to the old Catholic ideals of education. It is interesting to be further informed that one half the State Departments of Education are distinctly friendly to Latin, 15 are sympathetic, 7 neutral, and only 2 unsympathetic or unfriendly. Greek, of course, occupies a much less important place than Latin in both secondary and college instruction. About 11,000 high school and 16,000 college students were engaged in this study. Of 609 colleges in the continental United States, 606 will accept and 214 require Latin for admission to an A. B. course, but only 20 colleges require Greek, although 559 are willing to accept it for the same end. These statements are based on the results of the three-year investigation carried on under the direction of the American Classical League. — *America*.

A few excerpts from "Methods of Teaching in American Schools" by E. C. Broome in *Current History* (June) reveal interesting conditions in our system of popular education. It appears that we educate no longer for the simple life of a generation or so ago, when boys as a rule adopted the trade or profession of their fathers and girls had the ambition to become home-makers. Our scientific advancements have made education very complicated. State and local boards with little judgment of the value of what they were doing have lavished huge sums on "improvements" of the schools that are not only worthless, but plain obstacles to effective teaching. "Educators generally feel that the curriculum has grown in a very haphazard way." Legislatures, composed of politicians, and local school boards, composed of business men who only see the financial side of school administration, cannot remedy the existing evils. "The work

must be done by trained and experienced educators." The National Education Association now has "a coordinating committee" that is to direct the work. "Unfortunately the American people, as a whole, have not yet learned to place confidence in experts. They have a general feeling that common sense and Yankee ingenuity are more to be trusted than trained intelligence. . . . The average American of to-day will leave the technique of the law to his lawyer, the diagnosis and treatment of his ailments to his physician, and the buildings of his bridges and skyscrapers to his engineer; but the average American layman, whether educated or otherwise, is willing to debate with the trained and experienced educator almost any educational question, however technical. That explains why legislatures are so ready to determine what shall be taught in the public schools, and how it shall be taught. It helps to explain why good-government clubs and other lay associations more or less affiliated with schools and organized with no other purpose than to be helpful, have so frequently in the past endeavored to determine school practise." Conditions will become much worse in this respect if educational authority becomes centralized at Washington and the politicians determine school policies. The religious private schools of the country, before others, have reason to dread that consummation. As to popular distrust of educational experts, there is a reason for that also, and some of the "experts" are that reason.— "The problem with the elementary school curriculum is to determine what shall be the conduct of each subject and in what stage of the course it shall be most stressed. There have been nearly 300 research studies during the last ten or fifteen years devoted to aspects of this problem. Some conclusions that these investigations seem to indicate are these: That considerably more arithmetic is taught than adult life requires; that obsolete processes are still included; that there is too much drill in some processes and too little in others; that there is too much time wasted in learning to spell hundreds of words that the child will meet only in spelling-books; that oral reading is overemphasized and silent reading underemphasized; that much reading-matter, valueless as literature, is still read for purposes of drill; that writing in many schools is carried beyond the point of utility in these days when most writing is done on a machine; that in history there is still too much emphasis on battles, campaigns, and military heroes and not enough on the political, social, educational, industrial, and spiritual development of our nation; that appreciation is not sufficiently emphasized in the teaching of music and art, and that much of the handwork is of the 'exercise' type, instead of being vital, constructive work that grows out of, and into, the actual life of the pupils." As to the policy of accommodating private religious schools to such faulty curricula of the public schools, we should stop and consider whether there is any gain for real education by such accommodation. Accreditation is by no means an unmixed blessing; it may become a tyrannical power in the private religious schools. These latter schools may be accredited to death.

DAU.

Looking for "Catholic Carnegies" for Missionary Work among Non-Catholics.—*America* (March 14) makes an ardent appeal for "Catholic Carnegies." The closing paragraphs of the article are significant. We read: "Last, and by no means least, is the need for missionary work among non-Catholics. It has been done and is being done, thanks to those bands of self-sacrificing priests who spend their lives, and frequently shorten them, in the difficult, but gratifying work of carrying the light of faith to those who have been without it. There are hundreds and hundreds of communities where a Catholic priest is a curiosity. The zeal and the eloquence of the missionary is pitted against ignorance and prejudice that are almost abysmal. It seems like a hopeless task, but it is not. The need is to broaden the work. Here, then, is the great opportunity for one or two or a dozen Carnegies. They cannot educate, build churches, and engage personally in missionary work, but their money will give others the facilities for doing these things. And, curiously enough, the more they give, the more they are likely to have. Charity in its broad sense is like love as described by the poet who makes Juliet say that 'it is as boundless as the sea; the more I give, the more I have for thee.'"

MUELLER.

A Shrine to Mary.—The *Sunday-school Times* of May 2, 1925, writes: "While collections are being made between acts in theaters for the Cathedral on Morningside Heights, Roman Catholics are collecting for a great church in Washington, dedicated to the 'immaculate Mary.' The crypt now finished holds eighteen hundred people and is unsurpassed, we are told, for size and beauty in the whole world. In an appeal for further funds Bishop Shahan says: 'We are the most prosperous nation of the world. Can we not afford to make a small sacrifice, a tangible act of faith and love, in order to endow posterity with this wonderful edifice that shall forever voice our American Catholic devotion to that holy maid of Israel *who made possible our redemption from sin and eternal death?* This spacious basement will shelter a beautiful grotto of Lourdes, also several halls, in which will be housed a library of 20,000 books on the Blessed Virgin and a permanent exposition of the various phases of Marian art from its earliest beginnings. Is she not the mother of God? And can her divine Son refuse anything to her?'"

MUELLER.

Why Masonry Is Wrong.—The *Christian Cynosure* of June, 1925, brings the following significant and valuable statement from Rudyard Kipling, according to the *Kablegram* of April, 1925: "I was secretary for some years of the Lodge of Hope and Perseverance, No. 782 E. C. Lahore" (India). "I was entered by a member from Brahmo Somaj, a Hindu, passed by a Mohammedan, and raised by an Englishman. Our tyler was an Indian Jew." Comment is unnecessary.

MUELLER.

The Theater and Ministers.—Under this heading the *Watchman-Examiner* of May 14, 1925, presents editorially these pertinent remarks: "We have on our desk a gracious invitation from a New York

theater to attend a special presentation of a play at which "the clergy" of New York will be guests. The way some ministers lend themselves to the devil's work is enough to make the angels weep. A "moral" or "religious" play comes to town. The theater managers immediately send complimentary tickets to "the clergy," and many of them rise to the bait like a mountain trout and give to the manager a "noble" testimonial as to "the religious value" of the play in exchange for the three dollars' worth of tickets. Our advice to ministers who want to go to the theater is that they pay for their tickets and thus keep their self-respect. Our personal opinion is that the theater is no place for a minister of the Gospel, but if he goes at all, let him go to see Shakespeare's plays and let him eschew "religious" plays. Religious plays in the long run do more harm than evil plays. They are put on the stage not with high moral purposes, but to hoodwink the public and to win from the ranks of religious people new theatergoers. The plan works like a charm, for, going first to see "religious" plays, they soon get the theater habit, and when the theater habit becomes confirmed, the prayer-meeting habit loses its grip. The dramatic critic of a well-known paper says: 'Let us admit that the theater as a forum of morals is a joke, convincing nobody who is not already convinced. An honest sermon by an honest expounder of the Word is worth as a moral catholicon all the happy endings that ever turned any play into a lie. Let us remember the belief of Sir Arthur Pinero, the wisest of playwrights, that the exhibition of the most miserable of his transgressing heroines never deterred a woman from doing what her passion told her to do.' MUELLER.

The Only English Pope.—The *Catholic World* (May) writes: "Nearly eight centuries have passed away since the only English Pope walked St. Peter's Church, and on February 6 last a tablet bearing a Latin inscription enumerating his acts and virtues was unveiled in the crypt in the presence of Cardinal Merry del Val, Cardinal Gasquet, the Norwegian Minister, and many other clerical and lay dignitaries. The tablet was presented by the Norwegian Society of Scientists in memory of Adrian IV's connection with Norway when he was but a legate, and later when, as Pope, he continued to show special favor to Norwegian pilgrims to the Tomb of the Apostles. The arms of Norway, of the Cathedral of Nidores, and of the City of Trondhjem are upon the tablet, which is affixed to a pillar near the tomb of red Egyptian granite which contains the remains of the peasant Pope, Nicholas Breakspear." Of the *policy* of Adrian IV we are told: "One aim the new Pope kept before him constantly, and in the pages of the war and riot of those troubled times it shines with a clear, pure light. It was that the Holy Catholic Church should never be dominated by the ambitions of temporal kings. When Adrian IV met the Emperor Frederick Barbarossa at Sutri, the latter refused to follow custom and to hold the papal stirrup. Adrian, stung at this definite insult to his Church, refused the kiss of peace and did not rest until all quarrels ended in the submission of the Emperor, who held his stirrup at Nepi and received the pontifical embrace." The *New Schaff-Herzog* gives this version of Adrian's

policy: "Adrian was a ruler who grasped clearly the ideal of a papacy striving for universal domination and contended passionately for its accomplishment." This is a slightly different version and more in accordance with the facts of the case. Also, it must not be forgotten that, in the end, the Emperor worsted the Pope, who "made common cause with the rebellious citizens of Lombardy and thundered against the ruthless emperor the ban of excommunication. . . . But on the eve of the promulgation of the ban the great Pope expired of a quinsy, September 9, 1159." On June 13, in the parish church of the village of Abbots Langley in Hertfordshire, where Adrian IV was born, on the initiative of the Hertfordshire Branch of the Historical Association, the villagers will perpetuate in ceremony his memory by a tablet on the wall in the part built during his pontificate and by the acting of a play-pageant dealing with his short, though eventful life.

MUELLER.

The Return of the Jesuits. — With regard to the return of the Jesuit influence to Germany, the *Sunday-School Times*, of June 6, 1925, comments in its "Survey of Religious Life and Thought": "The militant order is back in Germany, and, for the first time since the *Kulturkampf*, a Jesuit has been made bishop. This is Dr. Ehrenfried, formerly of the *Collegium Germanicum* in Rome, and now Bishop of Wuerzburg. The *Bayrische Volkszeitung* quotes from the oath of office: 'Teachers of heresy, those who have separated themselves, rebels against our Lord and His successor will I with all my power persecute and oppose (*nach Kraeften verfolgen und bekämpfen*). So help me God.' Is it possible that Bishop Ehrenfried could take an oath so out of harmony with his attractive name (peace of honor)? In Rome, too, the Jesuits have been reinstated in the *Casa Generalizia della Compagnia*, the old headquarters close by the Church of the Gesu. *Lavoro*, a Roman wage-worker's journal, pictures the scene,—an urbane Jesuit father with two government representatives passing into the old and well-remembered building. When the officials speak of it as a gift of the government, the Jesuit gently corrects them 'Not a gift, a restoration.' They come to the cell of Ignatius Loyola, and the priest kneels in prayer, the officials waiting with uncovered heads. 'The latter are not quite able to analyze their feelings. They do not understand the embarrassment which possesses them. They feel themselves provincials, these representatives of the Kingdom of Italy, in the presence of this indefinable reverend father, who comes from great distances, perhaps from the monastery of Maria Laacho, from the antechamber of some South American legation, certainly from the unbounded kingdom of the *Societas Jesu*. On the threshold the reverend father bids them farewell. His voice is soft. The two officials stop a moment to look at him. His step is firm. He passes up the staircase of what is again, and from now on, the General House of the Company of Jesus. Though he does not speak, his voice says, "Behind me is a large army, all the Jesuits of the world. Make way!" The Kingdom of Italy has made way.'"

MUELLER.

The effort to understand Kant divided his followers into Supernaturalists, Rationalists, and Naturalists. The first understood Kant to have viewed the divine revelation as the perfection of natural religion; the second, that he regarded a divine revelation unnecessary for reason; the third, that he denied both the reality of the divine revelation and the perfection of religion by its means. The reason was because in his *Kritik der reinen Vernunft* Kant had denied the possibility of knowing human liberty, the existence of God, and immortality while in his *Kritik der praktischen Vernunft* he had admitted them as "moral postulates." Herbert Sanborn (*Methodist Quarterly Review*, April, p. 283) says: "Students inclined to stress the dualisms of Kant should read carefully the section entitled 'Von dem Primat der reinen praktischen Vernunft in ihrer Verbindung mit der spekulativen,' where we find among other equally significant statements: 'So ist es doch eine und dieselbe Vernunft' (thus it is, after all, one and the same reason) and: 'Weil das Interesse zuletzt praktisch ist und selbst das der spekulativen Vernunft nur bedingt und im praktischen Gebrauche allein vollstaendig ist' (because all interest is ultimately practical, and even that of speculative reason is only conditioned and in practical use alone is complete)." All effort to interpret Kant so as to make him any kind of a believer in the Christian revelation is futile; he was simply a rationalist.

DAU.

Zionist Settlements in Palestine.—On the present status of these settlements a report, dated at Tiberias, March 24, is published in the *New York Times*, May 10:—

"The Zionists are now saying that the outside world has misunderstood their object in coming to Palestine. They do not wish to claim the country as the national home for all Jews. Their aim, they say, is to establish colonies where the oppressed members of the race in Europe can maintain themselves and bring up their families in peace without fear of persecution.

"Since the arrival of the first batch of Zionist immigrants from Southern Europe, early in 1922, a great deal has been done to improve conditions in Palestine. Wide macademized roads have been built between Haifa and Nazareth and from the latter town to this ancient place on the Sea of Galilee and also to Jerusalem. There are also good roads leading from the Holy City to Beersheba and Jaffa.

"The colonies which have been started by the Zionists in the fertile districts are all in a flourishing condition. The great Plain of Esdraelon, which is forty miles long and about twelve miles in width at its broadest part, has been cultivated as far as the eye can reach, from the hilltop going from Haifa to Nazareth, and is a magnificent sight, with the new houses erected by the Zionists roofed with red tiles and grouped together on the community system.

"With all this comfort produced by the labor of their hands, many of the immigrants are dissatisfied because they have to lead their lives in solitude, away from the rest of the world. There has been a good deal of malaria, caused by the breaking of new ground,

which has been noted for fever since the days of the Crusaders and probably for ages before that time.

"The Zionists have been toiling in the fields from early dawn to late in the evening and begin to fear that they will develop into fellahs like the natives of the soil of Palestine and Syria. They say that there is no future for them beyond this continuous labor, which gives them a living, and that is all. Men whom I have talked with here and on the road to Nazareth expressed their disappointment that wealthy Jews from the United States and Europe have not come to settle in Palestine and invest their capital.

"I noticed on the road from Haifa there were more Arabs working on the Zionist allotments than I saw here three years ago. When the first Jewish colonies were established here in 1882 by Baron Edmund Rothschild, for poor families from Central and Eastern Europe, the immigrants soon discovered that it was easier to let the fellahs till the ground and cultivate the crops and take a percentage from them than to work the land themselves. Some of the Zionists appear to have adopted this principle, while others have left and returned to Europe.

"One source of trouble is that so many of the immigrants arriving now in Palestine have no capital, and are liable to become a burden on those who have been working hard for the past three years.

"A steamship which arrived at Haifa on Sunday, March 15, brought 500 immigrants, mostly old men and women and children. They looked a helpless lot and, I was informed, did not have \$2,500 in cash among the whole crowd to start life in a new country. It is a difficult problem for the Zionist immigration officials in Jerusalem to handle.

"Palestine is an agricultural country, and it will be very difficult to start industrial enterprises and make them pay expenses. Oil mills, cement works, and machinery plants have been erected at Haifa in substantial-looking buildings, but there is very little activity at the present time. Exports have fallen off during the past twelve months. Capital will have to be brought into Palestine before the country can be developed commercially.

"The Arabs are discontented because they see the government at Jerusalem employs the Zionist immigrant on all construction work in various parts of the country. They also look at the comfortable stone and red-roofed houses with glass windows in which the newcomers dwell with their families and then go back to the mud and wattle huts in the squalid villages where their own folks dwell. The difference in the styles of living is plainly visible to these sons of the desert, and they envy the newcomers who dwell in their land.

"The Government is now taking precautions to see that order is kept in the Holy City when Lord Balfour is there. Troops have been brought to the city with artillery and airplanes, and they are lining the streets of the ancient city to quell any attempt on the part of the mixed populace to revolt.

"There will be no danger of an invasion from Transjordania

while the British gendarmerie remains in Palestine. They were recruited from the old Irish Constabulary and proved themselves during the days before the Free State was established in Ireland.

"Jerusalem has been cleaned up under the control of the Governor, Sir Ronald Storrs, and the sanitary regulations have been much improved. The people who live in the narrow streets of the city itself have been taught to cover the garbage cans outside their doors at night and to sprinkle crude oil on top of the water in the cisterns to keep away the mosquitoes, which were the carriers of the malaria germs for centuries.

"The weather in Palestine has been fine and warm this winter with very little rain, the people say. Fully 8,000 Americans have visited the country since January 1 from the various cruising steamships and from Cairo by the rail route across the Suez Canal via El Kantara. Some of the horseshoe curves on the motor road from Nazareth to Jerusalem made them gasp.

"Jerusalem is becoming popular as a summer resort with the foreign residents in Egypt, who get half-rates on the railroad and find it cheaper to go there on their vacation. The climate of Jerusalem is also cooler in the summer than that of Cairo or Alexandria."

Communicated from Bismarck, N. Dak.

BOOK REVIEW.

Modernism and the Christian Faith. By *John Alfred Faulkner*. 306 pages. (The Methodist Book Concern.)

The professor of Church History at Drew Theological Seminary is one of the outstanding figures in the conservative part of the theological world of America. His present book was written in response to wishes expressed by young ministers and graduates of Drew who were dissatisfied with the teaching they received. Thus there was "providentially evoked" this book, which wrestles with this problem: "Is there anything in historic Christianity which in substance the modern man can not only receive, but joyfully fight for with the calm assurance and high elation of Wordsworth's 'Happy Warrior'? Is there anything in the spirit or results of science which makes it impossible for modern men to carry out the exhortation of that vigorous and downright spirit who urged his readers 'to contend earnestly for the faith which was once for all delivered unto the saints' (Jude 3)? Has Christianity *when rationally understood* [Italics mine!] anything to apologize for in the face of reason and the modern mind?" The author has confined himself "to those matters which are supposed to be most difficult to faith and most offensive to present-day thought." He uses the terms "modern" and "liberal" in his book "in their technical or artificial significance, for convenience, without blame or praise." Chapters III, VIII, and X are partial reprints from the *Methodist Review*, New York. Lastly, the author says: "I have been thrown into the company of a small band of intellectuals, all ministers except one who was formerly in the pulpit, but is now a teacher,

all representing the very left wing of evangelical churches, and three of them Unitarians. Some of the following essays were read to this group to get their reaction, to find out their criticism of Christianity as I understand it." So much as to the history of the origin of this treatise. At the same time this account will indicate to my readers the degree of conservatism in matters pertaining to the old faith which they may expect to find in this book. There is indeed a strong effort made throughout its pages to contend for the old faith, but some of the contents of that faith have been consciously discarded. The author knows the positions of modernists well, and his extensive reading in their writings, together with his personal acquaintance with many of them here and in Europe, makes his treatise a treasure-house of information. His lucid and animated style makes his book delightful reading. In eleven chapters he discusses the following topics on which modernist criticism centers: Authority; Inspiration; Miracle; Jesus; Atonement; Paul as the After-Christ; Trinity; Ritschl or Wesley? Hell. At the end of the book there are forty pages of most valuable notes on the following matters: Walter Pater on "Come unto Me"; Dr. G. A. Gordon on the *a priori* Ruling Out of the Divinity of Christ, and on Christ as the Eternal Prototype of Humanity in the Life of God, and the Resulting Kinship of Humanity with God; Prof. G. B. Foster and Dr. Gordon on Jesus; Prof. Alfred Seeberg on the Primitive Conception of Jesus; Prof. Erich Schaeder on Christ Praying to the Father; Bishop McConnell on Christ and the Creeds; Dr. Horton on the Church's Loss of the Cross; Dr. David Smith on Atonement in the Light of the Modern Spirit; "Original Sin." "Total Depravity"; Drs. Gordon, Liddett, Kahnis, Schultz, and White on the Trinity, and Church on the Incarnation; Prof. Schaeder on the Spring of the Trinity; Until He Come; The Alleged Early Martyrdom of John; Miracle and Sadhu Sundar Singh; The So-Called Virgin Birth. There is also a four-page index at the end of the book, covering the most important contents. To give my readers some means for estimating the quality of these contents, I shall transcribe some of Dr. Faulkner's opinions and judgments, good or bad: "Anything like the modern liberal Jesus was never a point at issue in ancient Christianity." (p. 16.) "Can we not say even now that it is doubtful whether the Church will subsist through the coming centuries when that bulwark of fact and truth which it confesses in its ancient and modern creeds is dissolved by the subjective fancies of its preachers and teachers?" (p. 18.) "Inspiration . . . does not mean that all parts of the Book are equally divine, that all parts are not also human, that the human and divine do not vary and interplay, that there are not mixtures and errors [!] in its vast evolution; it only means that as a *whole* it is a revelation from God, progressively unfolding His truth in various ways in the process of history, according to a loving purpose of redemption in Christ, who is its unity, its crown, its Lord, whose Spirit gave it and therefore is greater than it. The inspiration of the Bible does not mean that other bibles are not also from God so far as they contain goodness and truth; it means only that this is specially from God because it reveals His life in a way different from all other bibles, and in that difference is not relatively, but essentially superior." (p. 21.) "If the Bible is thus the spiritual life and light of men,

it is God-inspired and therefore in so far [!] infallible as to the religious elements which accomplish this." (p. 45.) "There is nothing irrational in miracle; it is only the free act of God in nature, analogous to all creative acts of man in the same territory." (p. 71.) "It is in accordance with the mind of Jesus," says Harnack, 'and at the same time a fact of history that this gospel [whether the Gospel of Christ or the gospel concerning Christ] can only be appropriated and adhered to in connection with a believing surrender to the person of Jesus Christ.... The peculiar character of the Christian religion is conditioned by the fact that every reference to God is at the same time a reference to Jesus Christ, and *vice versa*. In this sense the person of Christ is the central point of the religion and inseparably united with the substance of piety, as a sure reliance on God.... The Christian religion knows and names only one name before which it bows.... Just because the person of Christ has this significance, is the knowledge of the historical Christ required.' Think that through, Herr von Harnack, and you have the historic faith. Logically, Athanasius never said any more." (p. 114 f.) "The center of Christ's person was not human merely, nor divine merely, but human-divine and divine-human. It was humanity at its best, as it existed in God from eternity, [?] and though absolutely real as humanity, and therefore not a veil for His divinity, was yet unique. That is the impression our sources give us. As to anything further, perhaps modesty becomes us. We can fathom no personality. Should we seek to strip the mystery from Christ's?" (p. 119.) Indeed not; but the preexistence of the humanity of Christ will give a different aspect to His incarnation than that which Scripture knows—the soteriological one. "The atonement has to do with God's righteousness. God as love can forgive for the asking or without the asking, but God as holiness—that is another matter, it is said. Now, if there is a God at all (I mean a personal God: a God who is not a person, whatever else He may be, is not the Christian's God), it is easier for me to believe that He is righteous than that He is loving. If the dread alternative were presented, 'Which will you have, a holy or a loving God?' I would say, 'Give us a God who hates iniquity, whether He loves the evildoer or not.' A God who is love, but not a consuming fire, love, but not light, is an impossible God, a monster in a moral universe. A God who cares much for love, but nothing for justice may be a God for the Pleiades, but He is no God for our earth." (p. 153.) "We all feel the difficulty of eternal sin. Apparently, God did not consult us about that or many other difficulties. To me the awfulness of sin with its inevitable hell is not that it is to exist in eternity, but that it ever existed at all." (p. 255.)

DAU.

Christianity and the State. By *S. Parkes Cadman*. XI and 370 pages. (The Macmillan Company.)

During Lent 1922 the gifted author delivered several lectures at the Pacific School of Religion, Berkeley, Cal., upon the Earl Foundation. The substance of those lectures he offers us in this book. It is indeed "a vast and intricate theme" that he has set out to discuss, and many, when they heard of his undertaking, cherished the hope that his effort would help to clear up the vagueness which exists even in the best minds in our

country regarding the relation of Church and State to one another. I feel that this hope will be disappointed; for with all his wealth of reading, his extensive and minute knowledge of history, and his gift of finding, or creating, interesting perspectives, I do not see that he has made it a whit easier for us to apply under any conditions whatsoever the principle of the separation of Church and State, which is both a doctrine of Scripture and a principle of American statecraft, or to find a plain and safe way amid the perplexing, but inevitable interactions between Church and State for keeping the interests of each, not only distinct, but really separate. At times the author's presentation of his view has been so bafflingly intricate and disturbed by side reflections that I wished for some brief, pointed statement at the end of his argument as to what his position really is. I think, however, that many will enjoy reading his book for its style alone, and also for the author's skill in argument. Likewise, there will be many in these days so full of unionistic and millenarian tendencies who will applaud the author's view that through the unification of the churches and the dying out of the spirit of nationalism there will come a unification of states, and then "righteousness and good will shall yet abound in the earth," — a consummation for which the author expects Christians of every persuasion to look forward with longing. — Lutherans will probably be most interested in the fourth lecture, on the Modern State, because here the author discusses the secular changes that came in the wake of the German Reformation, and expresses his opinion on the relative importance of Luther's, Zwingli's, and Calvin's activities.

DAU.

Grundriss der Dogmengeschichte. Von *Reinhold Seeberg*. Vierte, vielfach verbesserte Auflage. VIII and 162 pages.

Die Lehre Luthers. Von *Reinhold Seeberg*. Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte. Vierter Band, erste Abteilung. Zweite und dritte, durchweg neubearbeitete Ausgabe. XII and 394 pages.

Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte. Von *Reinhold Seeberg*. Band IV, 2. Haelfte: *Die Fortbildung der reformatorischen Lehre und die gegenreformatorische Lehre*. Nebst alphabetischem Register ueber alle vier Baende. Zweite und dritte, durchweg neuausgearbeitete Auflage. XIV and 395—986 pages. (These three publications from A. Deichertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung Dr. Werner Scholl, Leipzig and Erlangen.)

The Christian Church is the sum total of believers in the teaching of Jesus Christ and His apostles. The condition of this body of men at any one time during the past nineteen centuries is determined by the influence which the teaching of the Founder of Christianity and His immediately appointed agents had on this religious body and on all men and affairs with which this body came in contact. Or I might put it this way: the fidelity of the members of the Church to their doctrinal standards is the meter by which the soundness of their inner Christian life is gauged and their outward successes or failures are understood. The history of the Church, then, is practically the history of its dogmas. Doctrine is the paramount issue in the Church at all times, and only by reason of its doctrines, chiefly, the *articulus stantis et cadentis ecclesiae*,

the Church is in a prosperous condition. This indicates the relative importance in the *ensemble* of theological studies of the study of History of Dogma and of treatises on the same. As regards the latter, the personal doctrinal position of the author is a matter of utmost moment. He must be a close and unbiased student and a faithful reporter of the facts of history, or his History of Dogma will turn out to be, not history, but fiction. A writer in the *Princeton Theological Review* ably explained this essential fact in a recent series of articles on Harnack's *History of Dogma*, setting forth that Harnack's treatise is valuable only as showing what Harnack thinks the dogma of the Church at any time has been. To what extent this criticism must be applied to Seeberg will appear from the following. His *Grundriss* is a marvel of condensation, and, with its bibliographical notes at the head of each division and subdivision, a great help. It divides into the introduction and three parts. In the introduction the author explains 1. the Concept and Scope of the History of Dogma; 2. the Method and Division of it; 3. the Literature of this branch of theological study. Part I treats the Formation of Dogma in the Old Church: Section I: The Beginnings of Dogma in the Post-apostolic and Old Catholic Age: Chapter 1: The Conception of Christianity in the Postapostolic Age: § 1. Introduction; § 2. Christianity as understood by the Postapostolic Fathers; § 3. Sources and Norms of Faith; Chapter 2: Heretical Interpretations of the Gospels and Attempts at Reform: § 1. Gnosis; § 2. Judaic Christianity; § 3. Marcion and Montanus; Chapter 3: The Beginnings of Ecclesiastical Theology; § 1. the Apologetes of the Old Church; § 2. the Dogmatization of the Canon, of the Rule of Faith, and of the Church; the Antignostic Fathers: § 3. Alexandrian Theology; Chapter 4: Doctrinal Development during the Third Century: § 1. Christology; § 2. Penitence and the Church; § 3. Comprehensive View of Christianity in the Western and the Eastern Church. Section II: The Formation of Dogmas in the Old Church: Chapter 1: The Trinitarian Dogma: § 1. Arius, Athanasius, and the First Council of Nice; § 2. Further Development until the Synod of Constantinople; § 3. Completion of the Doctrine of the Trinity; Chapter 2: The Christological Dogma: § 1. Christological Contrasts; § 2. Nestorius and Cyril, Ephesus 431; § 3. the Eutychian Controversy and the Synods of Ephesus and Chalcedon; § 4. the Monophysite and Monothelete Conflicts, and the Termination of the Development; Chapter 3: General View of Christianity and Conclusion of the Formation of Dogma in Greek Christendom: § 1. Greek Christendom; § 2. the Iconoclastic Conflicts and the Second Synod of Nice; Chapter 4: The Development of the Ecclesiastical Doctrines in the Occident under the Influence of Augustine (Church, Sin, and Grace): § 1. General View of the Religion and Theology of Augustine; § 2. the Donatist Controversy; Augustine's Concept of the Church and of Christianity; § 3. Pelagianism; Augustine's Doctrine of Sin and Grace; § 4. the Semi-pelagian Controversies; § 5. Tradition and the Papacy. The Second Part treats the Preservation, Changes, and Development of Dogma in the Medieval Church: Chapter 1: the History of Dogma from the Seventh to the Tenth Century; § 1. Introductory; Augustinianism of Gregory the Great; § 2. Controversies; the Adoptionist Controversy; § 3. Veneration of Images and *Filioque*; § 4. the Doctrine of Predestination; § 5. *De partu*

virginis; § 6. the Lord's Supper; § 7. Church and Penitence; Chapter 2: Doctrinal Views during the First Period of Scholasticism: § 1. Introduction; History of Theology from Anselm to Peter Lombard; § 2. Christological Contrasts; § 3. the Doctrine of Atonement; § 4. the Doctrine of the Eucharist; § 5. the Doctrine of Penitence; § 6. the Seven Sacraments; Chapter 3: the Ecclesiastical Doctrine during the Palmy Days of Scholasticism: § 1. the Theology of the Thirteenth Century; § 2. the Various Doctrines: God and Christ; § 3. the Original State and Sin; § 4. the Work of Christ; § 5. Grace and Human Liberty; Justification and Merit; § 6. the Sacraments; § 7. the Concept of the Church; Chapter 4: the Decay of Scholastic Theology and the Crisis of the Church at the End of the Middle Ages: § 1. Church and Life; § 2. Duns Scotus; § 3. the Theological Labors of the Later Scholastics; § 4. Augustinian Currents; § 5. Renaissance and Humanism. The Third Part treats the Development of Dogma by the Reformation and the Contrary Fixation of Doctrine by Catholicism; Section I: The Origin of the Protestant Concept of Doctrine; Chapter 1: the Doctrine of Luther: § 1. the Position of Luther in the History of Dogma; § 2. Luther's Doctrine in Its Original Form; § 3. the New Understanding of the Gospel from the Viewpoint of Evangelical Penitence (Faith, Works, Law, Gospel, Sin, Grace, Justification, Reconciliation); § 4. Luther's Conception of the Church, the Word and Sacrament; § 5. Luther's Attitude toward Scripture and Dogma; Chapter 2: Zwingli and Luther: § 1. the Reformatory Ideas of Zwingli; § 2. the Controversy about the Lord's Supper; Chapter 3: the New Dogma: § 1. the Augsburg Confession; § 2. the Older Reformed Confessions; Section II: The Expansion and (Temporary) Conclusion of the Protestant Concept of Doctrine; Chapter 1: the Lutheran Doctrine till the Form of Concord; § 1. the Theology of Melanchthon and Its Signification for the History of Dogma; § 2. the Theological Controversies of Lutheranism from the Death of Luther to the Form of Concord; § 3. the Form of Concord; Chapter 2: the Conclusion of the Formation of Dogmas in the Reformed Churches: § 1. the Theology of Calvin in Its Signification for the History of Dogma; § 2. the Doctrine of Calvin as Church Doctrine; Section III: The Conclusion of the Formation of Dogma in the Catholic Church: § 1. the Fixation of Medieval Theology as the Doctrine of the Church by the Council of Trent; § 2. the Reaction of the Augustinian Doctrine of Grace and Its Rejection by the Church; § 3. the Completion of the Roman Dogma of the Church; the Vatican Council; § 4. Conclusion.—I have been at pains to exhibit to the reader the full contents and the arrangement of materials in this *Grundriss*, because it exhibits most effectually Seeberg's method and shows where he sees the crises and turning-points in the history of dogma. His style is clear and vivacious; he favors the short sentence—a boon to the student. His citations from the doctrinal standards are given in the original; they are brief and pointed.—A word about some of the judgments which he expresses and, in particular, about his presentation of the Lutheran concepts of doctrine. He confines the meaning of the term "dogma" to what any church professes to teach, and the Scriptural or unscriptural character of the teaching is not taken into account. Accordingly, there is no chapter on the teaching of Christ and the apostles, this matter being relegated to a different department of theology.—Classical Antiquity and

Judaism are treated as preparatory stages to Christianity, and we hear again of "die grosse Sehnsucht nach einer andern Religion der Erlösung" on the part of pagans.— In the enumeration of the "*Heilsgaben*," as exhibited in the teaching of the Postapostolic Age, ἀφεσις τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν καὶ ὁ ἀγιασμὸς τῆς καθεδίας deserves the primary mention, before ζωή, γνῶσις, πίστις, and ἀθανασία; for Barnabas, who makes special mention of the former, shows how the *Didache*, which mentions the latter, is to be understood.— Ominous, though true to present-day facts, is the author's treatment, respectively, of Catholic and Protestant dogma: the former is presented as rigidly fixed and consummate, while the author sees no such thing as finality in Protestant dogma. This view, however, is subject to revision: since the setting up of papal infallibility Catholic dogma has become a very plastic and elastic affair; it can be readjusted any moment by *ex cathedra* deliverances *de fide* from the shrine of the Pope's heart, to suit Vatican policies. Protestant dogma was fixed, at least as far as the Lutheran Church is concerned, at the conclusion of the Reformatory movement: it is only modern pseudo-Protestantism that declines the fixedness of dogma. It has cast aside both the *norma normans* and the *norma normata* of Christian doctrine, and is simply philosophical speculation in Christian garb.— The most unsatisfactory chapters in the *Grundriss* are those dealing with the teaching of Luther and the Lutheran Church, pp. 120 ff. The renewing or sanctifying effects of faith are mentioned in the first, and the justifying effects in the second place. Justification is defined as "die allmähliche innere Erneuerung des Menschen." This view is in opposition to the citations from Luther's writings which the author himself has embodied in his treatise.

The two volumes of the *Lehrbuch* conclude the monumental work of the author on the History of Dogma. An immense amount of reading has had to be done for this work, and the bibliographies which the author, also in these volumes, has placed at the head of his chapters, with the references in his copious and critical footnotes, represent a small library and many years of incessant and close reading for their mastery. The contents of these two volumes cover the same territory as Part III of the *Grundriss*, also the sections and chapter divisions are the same, but there is, of course, an infinitely greater amount of detail and discussion of the minutiae of doctrine and doctrinal development. I cannot attempt a comprehensive judgment on the rich contents of these volumes. They are exhaustive treatises, and nearly every section will require several readings, and digesting, and testing. The author plainly appeals to the learned public and its expert verdict. However, there are thoughtful remarks in his *Vorwort* which deserve to be pondered by teachers of classes in the History of Dogma. These two volumes were compiled during the miseries which engulfed particularly the learned part of the population of Germany during the fatal closing years of the World War, and the still more fatal years which began for the stricken German nation with the "Schmachtfrieden von Versailles." The author sought relief in these profound studies from the poignant griefs of a loyal German nationalist. He expresses the hope that the precarious conditions under which learned Germans now have to do their work may not have affected the quality of his workmanship. And then he goes on to say:

"The work which has been concluded will perhaps for a measurable time remain the last comprehensive presentation which the History of Dogma has been given during the last two generations according to the customary method. The peculiar feature of this method has been the combining of the general development of ideas with the particular doctrines and in joining exact analyses of sources with a consecutive presentation of the general development. The great treatises in this department of theology have had a controlling, confirming, supplementing, and correcting influence on each other. The many minor treatises of our theological discipline have proved stimulating in many particular ways by the exact knowledge of its authors in special territories and have thus proved the didactic value of the method which I have described. In a certain respect this conception of the History of Dogma may now be said to have reached its end. What we are lacking at the present time, as far as I can see, is these two things: in the first place, we still need a great number of special monographs which will either extend to remoter territories, personalities, and periods, or will trace particular concepts through the entire territory of development. [This latter, I believe, is the primary *desideratum*.] In this way the basic lines which we have discovered hitherto will stand out in clearer and stronger outline, and, on the other hand, the straight line, which the study of the principal doctrinal phenomena has given us, will not infrequently show curvatures and nodules, which will cause us to see much more plainly their general tendency,—not to mention all the detailed corrections and supplements which will result. Especially in the department of Medieval History of Dogma we shall be advanced considerably in this way, as the labors of Grabmann or Baeumker and his school have abundantly proved. The same holds good with regard to the study of Protestant doctrine. When I compare, for instance, Heim's work on the problem of assurance, or Hirsch's book on Osiander with the basic lines that I have drawn, I acknowledge most gratefully that they afford those supplements, corrections, and confirmations which I have had in mind.—But there is another need. In view of the immense materials with which the great treatises on the History of Dogma are working, and in view of the fact that the brief treatises wish to embody as much as possible of these materials, there is a danger that the forest is not seen for the trees, and especially that the question concerning the truth and the value of the doctrines presented will not be discussed. The former evil leads to that unfruitful abundance of knowledge which is found among theologians ("theologisch unfruchtbarem Vielwissen"), the latter to that relativism which so easily attaches itself to historicism. Now, both these dangers should be avoided in great treatises, as I have tried to do in this work. These dangers can also be avoided in lectures if proper attention is paid to these two viewpoints, to wit, that lectures on the History of Dogma are to supplement the knowledge of the general development in Church History, and that they are a historical preparation for the critical review of ecclesiastical concepts in Dogmatics. Nevertheless, if I rightly view the beginnings of the coming intellectual development, there is going to be felt in wide circles, among theologians as well as non-theologians, a need for treatises on the History of Dogma which will not only place in the center of interest the inner

logic of the ecclesiastical development of ideas in their connection with the general history of philosophical and ethical cultural tendencies, but will also cast up the question, how much of truth they embody. Before all others we can think in this connection of the example given us by Dilthey and his followers. I do not disguise to myself the difficulty of such labors. They consist principally in an overreadiness to construe events so that they may fit into a preconceived scheme, and in an unfruitful criticism of ideas that have been only superficially or imperfectly grasped. Instances of this have never been lacking in the history of our theological discipline. Nevertheless, I believe that the knowledge so far gained in the History of Dogma has rightly opened up so many sources and has correctly reproduced such important lines of development that any person who has really made all this material his own should be in a position to engage with profit in historico-philosophical reflections upon the historical nexus and the laws of this development, as well as upon their truth and their importance for the general development of mankind. That almost dogmatic authority which Dilthey's spiritual reflections gained for him in wide circles, among historians, jurists, and philosophers, is the very reason why one could wish that in the interest of scientific knowledge the careful and fruitful labors of the theological History of Dogma might be more extensively appropriated also by this class of people for their investigations and the forming of their opinions, all the more so because the History of Dogma is making ever greater efforts to take into account the connection between the development of religious ideas and the general history of the human mind, as a glance at this last treatise on the History of Dogma will show. Accordingly, my wish is that in the future there may be no lack of treatises projected along grand lines—'grosszuegig,' as the modern term would call them—and that there may not be wanting the great urge after knowledge of the truth and reality. Such treatises would aid much towards reviving interest in this theological discipline, towards making the customary problems proposed during its study profounder, and towards making the materials collected for it more generally fruitful for all our thinking." It is a good suggestion to make the results of the investigations that have been carried on in the theological department of the History of Dogma available to the learned world in general and to all persons who wish to be regarded as well educated. I can agree with the learned author readily on this point, however, from a different motive than that which has prompted his suggestion. His idea evidently is that religion, including the Christian religion, should be exhibited as one of the products of thinking men, an evolved thought of the race on a level with other evolved thoughts. This will prove a futile endeavor if the divine and mysterious origin of the religion of salvation by means of faith in the vicarious atonement rendered by Christ, living and dying for all men, which the Christian Bible teaches, be accepted as a fact.

DAU.

Grundriss der Theologischen Ethik. Von Dr. Otto Kirn. Vierte Auflage. Nach dem Tode des Verfassers herausgegeben von D. Dr. Hans Preuss. VII and 76 pages.

System der Ethik. Von Reinhold Seeberg. Zweite, neubearbeitete Auflage. XI and 295 pages. (Both publications of A. Deichertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung Dr. Werner Scholl, Leipzig and Erlangen.)

Since the rise of Pietism it has become customary to treat Christian ethics as a separate theological discipline, distinct from Christian dogmatics. The separation was meant as a rebuke of "dead orthodoxy," the overemphasis of "reine Lehre," and that theological intellectualism which rests content with knowing while neglecting the doing of the divine will. The chief, if not the only advantage gained by this division, as far as I can see, is that a more thorough treatment can thus be accorded to both the doctrinal and the moral contents of the divine revelation. Granting the usefulness of the division from this point of view, the inner connection between Christian dogmatics and Christian ethics must nevertheless be insisted on, or serious damage will be done both to Christian faith and Christian life. The following considerations will show the necessary inner unity of systematic and moral theology: 1. Both what we are to believe for our salvation and how we are to live as persons who have accepted the salvation of God rest on the identical authority, the *avt̄os ē̄p̄a* of the Lord as recorded in the Holy Scriptures. Neither the saving doctrine nor the moral precepts by which the saved must live can be evolved from, or determined and regulated by, the will of man, if they are to preserve their Christian character. The same God who by His Word bends our intellect to know what He wants us to know bends our affections and will to do what He wants us to do, regardless of the protests which the natural logic of men may raise in either case. 2. No Christian doctrine was ever revealed merely for the enrichment or delight of the human mind, and the mere head knowledge of doctrines, far from being a meritorious achievement, may become the basis of a person's damnation. Theology, in all its departments, is ever practical, thoroughly practical, never theoretical, purely contemplative. It aims at the creation of a new life and conversation; every doctrine of the Christian Creed is lived, not only mentally apperceived; it somehow affects our whole thought, will, and desire, and is somehow expressed in our conduct. For instance, the doctrine of the vicarious satisfaction for the sins of the world by the perfect life and innocent death of the incarnate Son of God is not really held and retained by any mind except with such concomitant psychological phenomena as penitent humility, cheerful confidence, and holy zeal. 3. The Christian life is a product of divine grace and rests exclusively on gracious facts propounded in dogmatics in the chapters on Theology Proper, Christology, and Soteriology. The Christ for us and the Christ in us is the same divine-human Deliverer, conveyed to us by the same medium, the Gospel of grace, and received by us by the same agency, faith. The justifying and the sanctifying effects of the redeeming work of the God of grace are connected with one another by such an indissoluble *nexus causalis* that the one cannot be genuine without the other. These reflexions may aid to ward off dangers which are created by the divorce of Christian ethics from Christian dogmatics. The chief danger is that the works or acts of a Christian life may be viewed and treated apart from their motive power, divine grace, and hence beget an utterly false conception of Christian living. This danger

exists in most modern text-books on Ethics, and the two volumes before us are no exception to the rule.—As regards their contents, there is much similarity between them in the general arrangement of the materials of ethics. Kirn's brief syllabus treats in an introductory chapter the concept and function, the sources, and the method of theological ethics. The treatise proper is divided into two parts: In Part I the author presents the "Ethische Prinzipienlehre," and exhibits in four chapters "Das Subjekt der Sittlichkeit," man as an individual and as a social unit, "Das Wesen des Sittlichen," "Die Begründung des Sittlichen," and "Die ethischen Prinzipien des Christentums." This arrangement is due to the author's view that morality is independent of religion, and that Christianity is merely the most highly perfected combination of religion and morality. In Part II we have a Systematic Presentation of the Christian Moral Life under these sub-heads: "Der Ausgangspunkt der christlich-sittlichen Lebensbewegung (Sünde und Erlösung)"; "Das Werden der christlich-sittlichen Persönlichkeit"; "Die Entfaltung der christlich-sittlichen Persönlichkeit"; "Die Betaetigung der Sittlichkeit in der Gemeinschaft." The author denies the culpability of inherited sin, p. 31; and distinguishes, in regeneration, what God does and what man does, p. 37. He voices the old state-church principle on p. 75.—Seeberg offers a thoughtful "Vorwort," in which he discusses technical questions relating to the treatment of ethics in theology. His book is divided into two parts. Part I presents the Fundamental Problems and the Method of Ethics; the history of this theological discipline. In Part II the author offers his System of Christian Ethics under the following subdivisions: The Origin and Contents, the Development and Preservation, and the Application of Christian Ethics to Communal Life. The contents are well indexed.

DAU.

Centralfragen der Dogmatik in der Gegenwart. Sechs Vorlesungen von Dr. Ludwig Ihmels. Vierte, durchgesehene Auflage. VIII and 193 pages. (A. Deichertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung Dr. Werner Scholl, Leipzig and Erlangen.)

In 1909 the Royal Saxon *Kultusministerium* arranged a course in theology for teachers of the Saxon state-schools. The object was to give the teachers an insight into the problems created in theology by modernism, and to suggest a solution of these problems. This is the origin of the six lectures contained in this book, which was issued for the fourth time in a revised edition on Luther's birthday in 1920. All the questions discussed here belong in the department of dogmatics. Every lecture is preceded by a bibliographical note of the treatises and monographs which are subjected to a review in the lectures. At the end of the book are 25 pages of notes and an index of 3 pages. The following subjects are discussed: I. Glaube und Dogma; II. Das Christentum, sein Wesen und seine Absolutheit; III. Das Wesen der Offenbarung; IV. Die Person Jesu; V. Das Werk Jesu in seiner bleibenden Bedeutung für die Gemeinde; VI. Die Gewissheit des Glaubens. Dr. Ihmels has expressed the hope that on each of these topics he has given his hearers not only a fair account of the status of present-day theological discussion, but also an insight into his own position. I cannot say that the latter hope has been realized. Dr. Ihmels's method is somewhat like this: he restates a given dogmatic

problem and examines it from a number of viewpoints, and then pronounces it either meritorious or otherwise. Likewise he states the doctrine of Scripture and of the Lutheran Confessions, and examines that, leading up again to some judgment which he pronounces. There is favorable and unfavorable criticism offered in both attempts, and the result is that at the end of the inquiry the reader is left in suspense as to what is the exact, precise, plain belief which Dr. Ihmels holds on the subject discussed and what he recommends to his readers as a genuine *credendum*. There are whole pages in this book in which he speaks the language of orthodox Lutheranism, the language of Scripture. But there are also pages where the critical readers will fill the margin with question-marks. I shall offer a few samples from the third lecture: "Auch ausserhalb der christlichen Welt hat eben der goettliche Logos sich bezeugt, aber es waren nur Stuecke der Wahrheit, die das Heidentum besass." "Auch die Reformation und erst recht die alte Dogmatik blieb im wesentlichen bei dem intellektualistischen Offenbarungsverstaendnis stehen." "Grundsätzlich angesehen, besteht zwischen dem reformatorischen Verstaendnis der Schrift und der Offenbarung eine Inkongruenz." "Es ist verkehrt, wenn die alte Dogmatik die Offenbarung sogleich mit einer Mitteilung uebernatuerlicher Wahrheiten einsetzen laesst." "Eine absolute Notwendigkeit ist fuer die Schrift nicht in derselben Weise wie fuer das Offenbarungswort selbst zu behaupten." Etc., etc.

DAU.

Kants Lehre vom intelligiblen Charakter. Ein Beitrag zu seiner Freiheitslehre von *Lic. theol. Ernst Sommerlath.* VI and 110 pages. (A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung Dr. Werner Scholl, Leipzig and Erlangen.)

For a military pastor at a fortified garrison during the late war to write a treatise of this kind is certainly a mental feat. The treatise is another attempt to solve the old problem of what Kant meant when, in his *Critique of Practical Reason* he spoke of a "transzendentale Freiheit, welche als Unabhaengigkeit von allem Empirischen und also von der Natur ueberhaupt gedacht werden muss, sie mag nun Gegenstand des inneren Sinnes, bloss in der Zeit, oder auch der aeusseren Sinne, im Raume und der Zeit zugleich, betrachtet werden." It appears that Kant conceived of a species of human liberty different from the old *liberum arbitrium indifferentiae*, which is simply the capacity or possibility to make this or that choice without the prompting of any particular motive. He spoke of a liberty that is "independence from empirical conditions," or "independence from alien determining causes." Sommerlath lays hold of these definitions and claims that the liberty which Kant had in view was not simply "Verursachungslosigkeit, das ist, schlechthinnige Willkuer," the absence of all causation, or sheer arbitrariness, but that it was itself a causality, however, not a causality such as is found in nature, but an "intelligible, Dingen an sich eignende Kausalitaet." It works according to a law, or laws, and is thus regulated, and this feature of being regulated Kant calls "the character," and because it can be grasped by the intellect, he calls it "the intelligible character" of liberty. Sommerlath's treatise is an inquiry into this character, or into the laws of absolute (?) liberty.

DAU.

A History of the Japanese People from the Earliest Times to the End of the Meiji Era. By *Capt. F. Brinkley, R. A.*, with the collaboration of *Baron Kikuchi*. With 150 illustrations engraved on wood by Japanese artists, half-tone plates, and maps. IX and 784 pages; printed on India paper. (The Encyclopedia Britannica Co., New York.)

At whatever place you tap this volume, the reservoirs of learning and extensive research give forth a liberal stream of information that is not obtained as readily from other sources. The twin authors of the book have collaborated with splendid effect. Captain Brinkley entered Japan in 1867 as a professor in the Imperial College, later becoming foreign adviser to the Japanese Government. He married a Japanese wife and thoroughly identified himself with Japan. He did not only write this history of Japan, but also made part of its recent history, for he played an important part in the direction of Japan's national policy. Baron Kikuchi formerly was president of the Imperial University at Kyoto. As a leader of the educational and intellectual life of his country he occupies about the same position in Japan as Charles W. Eliot is considered by many as holding in the United States. This book—the life-work of Capt. Brinkley—is justly regarded as the last word so far about anything Japanese that has entered into the annals of history. Moreover, the evident political importance of Japan in world politics and its peculiar relations to the United States make this book a publication of moment to Americans. The description which the author gives of the most recent political development in the Far East seems to question the honesty of Germany in its dealings with Japan, while it acquiesces in the doings of Russia and Japan, and plainly suggests that Great Britain is the one correct actor in the Eastern political drama. The treatment which Germany during the late war received from the Japanese people showed that the people of Japan cherished no resentment against the people of Germany.

DAU.

Brief Mention.

The following publications have been received: 1. *Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick's First Sermon* as pastor-elect of Park Ave. Baptist Church, New York City. 2. *Catalog of the Waterloo College of Arts and Prospectus of Waterloo College School*, the High School Department of the Evangelical Lutheran Seminary, at Waterloo, Ont., Can. 3. *Prospectus of the Eisenach Old Selections. An Exegetico-Homiletical Treatment*, by *R. C. H. Lenski, D. D.* 4. *Is Dancing a Sin?* A fine tract by *B. M. Holt*, Fargo, N. Dak., of which seventy thousand copies have been sold so far. 5. *Program of the Convention of the Luthergesellschaft*, Muenchen, Bavaria, July 17—20. 6. *Harry B. Hawes*, an Intimate Sketch, by *Lewis B. Ely*. 7. *Inside Facts as I Found Them* concerning the Ku Klux Klan of the British Empire, by a *Klansman*. 8. *Who Are the Mormons?* Open Letter by *Elder Nephi Jensen*, President of the Canadian Mission. 9. *The Northwestern Clarion*, Vol. 4, No. 2, edited by *Prof. W. Moenkemoeller*, shows what the Lutheran Education Association of the Northwest is planning to do for Concordia College at St. Paul, Minn. 10. *Kommst du nur heim*, a beautiful poem of consolation and cheer, by *Dr. T. Nickel*, the President of the Saxon *Freikirche*, set to music by his son, *Rev. T. Nickel, Jr.*

DAU.